

REMARKS

Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1 and 3-9 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Philbrick et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037406). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a network-storage apparatus comprising "a peripheral memory controller for controlling the peripheral memory and storing or outputting the transmitted data between the disc storage and the network." In other words, the peripheral memory controller controls the transfer of data to or from the disc storage and the network.

The Examiner states that the network-storage apparatus of claim 1 reads on INIC 22 of Philbrick. However, the Examiner does not cite any portion of Philbrick to disclose the "peripheral memory controller," but rather only cites paragraph [0053]. It is clear that the file system 23 of the host 20 controls the peripheral memory, and that no portion of the INIC 22 performs this task.

For instance, paragraph [0053] discloses that a "file stream of data" is sent "under control of the file system 23." Paragraph [0089] discloses that the server file system, i.e., file system 23, instructs a host SCSI driver to fetch 100 KB of data from server attached storage unit 634. Paragraph [0089] further discloses that the data is stored in the "file cache" of the server 600. No portion of Philbrick discloses that the INIC 22 controls any part of the process of transferring data from the disc storage to the peripheral memory.

Although data is certainly transferred from the disc storage of Philbrick to the INIC cache 46, the INIC itself does not control this transfer for the purposes of transmission.

Accordingly, Philbrick fails to teach, or even suggest, a network-storage apparatus comprising "a peripheral memory controller for controlling the peripheral memory and storing or outputting the transmitted data between the disc storage and the network."

Claims 3-9 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 

Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: January 17, 2007